UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,162	07/03/2003	Xuejun You	9896-000003	9181

27572   7590   04/30/2008
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. BOX 828
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48303

EXAMINER
RUSSELL, WANDA Z

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2616	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/30/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments, filed 4/9/2008 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

2.   Applicant argues that the Examiner asserts that the 34 along with 42 and 44

performs the dynamic allocation are also hardware devices, but submits that any

software has to be implemented in hardware. However, the hardware devices cited by

the Examiner are devices used for implementing the software.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As applicant points out, any <u>software has to be implemented in hardware</u>. Then

the devices cited by the Examiner used for implementing the software are<u> hardware

devices</u>.

3.   Applicant argues that the N-selected-one device of the claimed invention is not

an equivalent of the module of Svacek. Further, the N-selected-one device of claim 6

has N inputs and an output and each of the N inputs can be selected to be in

communication with the output. In contrast, the module of Svacek at best appears to be

merely a module inserted in the slot without any information concerning its input or

output being disclosed.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As seen in Fig. 3, <u>Slots 1 to N are N inputs and the out put of X-connect is an

output</u>, clearly described.

4.   Applicant argues that ΔB is not equivalent to the "number of parallel bits to each slot" of Svacek based on paragraphs [0012] and [0032] of Svacek.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

The paragraph [0032], lines 5-12 states "A system comprised of eight (8) personality modules #1-8 each requiring ten (10) parallel bits of bandwidth for a total of eighty (80) parallel bits, can utilize all of the personality modules, even if only 40 parallel bits can be supported at one time". In addition, the bandwidth in [0028], line 7 of Svacek is N*ΔB as claimed. N*ΔB could be equal or less than B.

5.   Applicant argues that the main control module in claim 6 allocates the bandwidth to the slots indirectly through controlling the N-selected-one devices which are connected between the main control module and the slots. However, there is no equivalent of the N-selected-one devices disclosed in Svacek. The bandwidth of Svacek is directly allocated to the slots by running the program.

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Claims do not have the language of functional details regarding the directly or indirectly connection between the main control module and the slots.

6.   New limitation recited in claim 9 raises new issues and requires further search and consideration.

WZR/Wanda Z Russell/

Examiner, Art Unit 2616

/Seema S. Rao/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2616